

Applicants : Jeremy A. Fogg et al.
Appln. No. : 10/783,273
Page : 7

REMARKS

In the Office Action of May 17, 2005 the Examiner has indicated, and the Applicants acknowledge, that claims 1-7 and 20-23 remain pending. Claims 8-19 have been cancelled via this paper without prejudice in response to an earlier issued restriction requirement. Claims 3 and 4 have been amended via this paper to more clearly define the invention. These amendments were not made to distinguish from prior art, therefore, all claims and claim limitations shall be construed as encompassing all equivalent structure and function.

Turning to paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The applicant respectfully points out that element 458, a shim assembly, and element 459, an alignment shim, are depicted in at least Fig. 4. Therefore, the Applicant's request that this objection be removed.

Turning to paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Applicants submit herewith a replacement sheet depicting the revision of reference number 458. Therefore, this objection is now moot.

Turning to paragraph 6 of the Office Action, the Applicants respectfully submit that the language referred to by the Examiner, taken from the MPEP, is in permissive form using the word "should". There is no requirement in the patent laws or rules stating

Applicants : Jeremy A. Fogg et al.
Appln. No. : 10/783,273
Page : 8

that the abstract "shall" have any specific content. Therefore, the Applicants request that this objection be removed.

Turning to paragraph 7 of the Office Action, the Applicants submit herewith an amended paragraph 34. Therefore, this objection is now moot.

Turning now to paragraph 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. The Applicants respectfully point to MPEP §608.01(I) which states, "In establishing a disclosure, applicant may rely not only on the description and drawing as filed but also on the original claims....." Since the claims now pending are original claims, the Applicants request that this rejection be removed.

Tuning to paragraph 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to claims 3, 4 and 20. The Applicants have amended claims 3, 4 and 20 via this paper, therefore, request that this objection be removed.

Turning to paragraph 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 4 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,124,549, to Michaels et al. The Applicants respectfully submit that Michaels et al. discloses a light sensor comprising a single photo responsive detector as discussed in column 4, lines 47-54 and column 6, line 66 through column 7, line 3; Michaels et al. does not disclose an image sensor or use thereof. The adjustment means discussed in column 5, lines 54-61, of Michaels et al. is directed to changing the position of the detector (more precisely the circuit board 24, as discussed in column 6, lines 47-54) relative the associated lens; the adjustment screw only provides for moving the height of the

Applicants : Jeremy A. Fogg et al.
Appln. No. : 10/783,273
Page : 9

detector within the associated housing relative the lens. The Applicants respectfully submit that movement of an image sensor relative a lens will have a quite different result than movement of a single photosensitive detector relative a lens. Furthermore, the alignment pin 46 (which the Examiner refers to as an "attachment member") of Michaels et al. is not an equivalent structure to the attachment member recited in the claims of the present application; the alignment pins of Michaels et al. are for positioning only the lens as discussed in column 5, lines 9-14; the alignment pins of Michaels et al. have no effect what so ever on positioning of the detector.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Michaels et al. does not teach or suggest an automatic vehicle exterior light control system, comprising: an attachment member and carrier/baffle configured to secure an imager board within approximately 5 degrees and approximately -5 degrees of a desired image sensor optical axis as recited in claim 1 of the present application. In that claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1, the Applicants submit that claims 1, 3 and 4 are in condition for allowance over Michaels et al.

Additionally, the Applicants respectfully submit that Michaels et al. does not teach or suggest an automatic vehicle equipment control system, comprising: an attachment member and carrier configured to secure an imager board within approximately 5 degrees and approximately -5 degrees of a desired image sensor optical axis, said attachment member and said carrier cooperate to define an actual image sensor optical axis as recited in claim 20 of the present application. Therefore, the Applicants submit that claim 20 is in condition for allowance over Michaels et al.

Applicants : Jeremy A. Fogg et al.
Appln. No. : 10/783,273
Page : 10

Turning to paragraph 15, the Examiner has rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Michaels et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,429,594, to Stam et al. The Applicants submit that at least for the reasons expressed above and in light of the fact that claim 2 depends from claim 1 that claim 2 is in condition for allowance over Michaels et al., Stam et al. and the combination thereof.

Turning to paragraph 14, the Examiner has rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Michaels et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,429,594, to Stam et al. The Applicants submit that at least for the reasons expressed above and in light of the fact that claim 2 depends from claim 1 that claim 2 is in condition for allowance over Michaels et al., Stam et al. and the combination thereof.

Turning to paragraph 15, the Examiner has rejected claims 5 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Michaels et al. in view of U.S. Patent 4,708,410, to Blank et al. The Applicants submit that at least for the reasons expressed above and in light of the fact that claim 5 depends from claim 1 and claim 23 depends from claim 20 that claims 5 and 23 are in condition for allowance over Michaels et al., Blank et al. and the combination thereof.

Applicants : Jeremy A. Fogg et al.
Appln. No. : 10/783,273
Page : 11

The Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that claims 1-7 and 20-23, as currently presented, are in condition for allowance. In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that the present invention, as defined in the pending claims, is allowable over the prior art of record. The Examiner's reconsideration and timely allowance of the claims is requested. A Notice of Allowance is, therefore, respectfully solicited. Please contact the undersigned should additional information be required.

Respectfully submitted,
JEREMY A. FOGG ET AL.
By: Gentex Corporation

August 15, 2005
Date

James E. Shultz Jr.
James E. Shultz Jr.
Registration No. 50,511
600 N. Centennial Street
Zeeland, Michigan 49464
616/772-1800